DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 778 CG 018 063

AUTHOR Simpson, Nancy
TITLE The Mentor-Protege Relationship in Professional Psychology: A Survey of Faculty and Student Attitudes.
PUB DATE Mar 84
NOTE 50p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association (30th, New Orleans, LA, March 28-31, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; College Students; Higher Education; *Mentors; Psychology; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

While the business world has recognized the importance of mentoring, very little notice has been taken in academia. To examine the attitudes of faculty and students toward the mentoring relationship, 16 faculty members and 60 doctoral students in clinical and counseling psychology were surveyed. The questionnaire was organized into definitions of the mentor-protege relationship, self-ratings of mentor and protege personality traits and behaviors, environmental influences on the mentoring process, and frequency of the relationship within the department. Results indicated that students and faculty generally hold similar perceptions of mentoring and think it is a valuable process. Significant differences were found on behavior scores, with applied faculty members and third year students scoring highest on a measure assessing mentor and protege behaviors. While the vast majority (94 percent) of students felt they would like to become involved in a mentoring relationship if the opportunity existed, only 43 percent felt that mentoring was occurring in their program. (The Student Survey and Faculty Survey are appended.) (Author/LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED254778

THE MENTOR-PROTEGE RELATIONSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY: A SURVEY OF FACULTY AND STUDENT ATTITUDES

Nancy Simpscn

Florida Institute of Technology

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy Simpson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES.....iii

ABSRACT.....iv

INTRODUCTION.....1

REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....2

METHOD.....8

Subjects.....8

Survey.....8

Analysis of the Data.....10

RESULTS.....10

DISCUSSION.....20

REFERENCES.....24

APPENDIX A.....27

APPENDIX B.....36

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1. Subject Demographics.....9

Table 2. Faculty and Student Response to Specific Mentoring Questions.....11

Table 3. Student and Faculty Description of Mentoring.....13

Table 4. Mean, Standard Deviation, and F Values of Faculty Trait and Behavior Scores.....15

Table 5. Mean, Standard Deviation, and F Values of Student Trait and Behavior Scores.....16

Table 6. Percentage and Chi Square Values of Faculty Responses to Specific Mentoring Questions....18

Table 7. Percentage and Chi Square Values of Student Responses to Specific Mentoring Questions....19

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1. Mentor Behaviors.....7

Figure 2. Protege Behaviors.....8

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to assess the attitudes of faculty and students regarding the mentoring relationship. Sixteen (16) faculty members and sixty (60) doctoral students in clinical and counseling psychology from a medium sized university within the southeast completed the survey. The questionnaire was organized into four major areas. These included: definitions of the mentor-protege relationship, self-ratings of mentor and protege personality traits and behaviors, environmental influences on the mentoring process and frequency of the relationship within the department. Results indicate that students and faculty generally hold similar perceptions of mentoring and think it is a valuable process. Significant differences were found on behavior scores with applied faculty members and third year students scoring highest on a measure assessing mentor and protege type behaviors. While the vast majority (94%) of students feel they would like to become involved in a mentoring relationship if the opportunity existed, only 43% feel mentoring is occurring in the particular program. The investigation may have served to increase awareness of the mentoring process and provides somewhat of a foundation in future research for the development of workshops on teaching the skills necessary in establishing and maintaining a mentor-protege relationship.

The Mentor-Protege Relationship in Professional Psychology: A Survey of Faculty and Student Attitudes

There has been recent emphasis in the business world and the popular press on the importance of mentoring in the career development of young professionals. Mentoring has been described in the literature as one of the most complex, important relationships in the career development of young adults (Levinson, 1978). The business world has been the first to recognize the importance of mentoring relationships in the productivity and satisfaction of young managers. There seems to be a proliferation of newspaper and magazine articles which give advice on how to obtain a mentor. In spite of this recent interest in the mentor-protege relationship, there have been relatively few empirical studies. The research that has been undertaken has been mostly descriptive, anecdotal studies of characteristics of self-reported mentor-protege dyads.

While the business world has recognized the importance of mentoring, very little notice has been taken in academia. There is minimal study as to the role of professors, advisors, and supervisors in the professional development of their graduate students. The purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes, needs and perceptions of students and faculty toward the mentoring process in a university-based, professional

training program. This study is a first step in the definition of the mentor-protege relationship as it applies to graduate training in professional psychology.

Review of Literature

Even though research and theoretical literature on mentoring is very limited, attempts have been made to define and describe the process (Phillips, 1977; Kram, 1980; Alleman, 1982). Phillips makes a distinction between primary and secondary mentors. Primary mentors make sacrifices and take risks for their proteges while secondary mentors are less self sacrificing, giving aid as part of the duties of their job. She goes on to define motives, kinds of aid and stages of the relationship. According to Phillips, mentors help proteges in order to get their own work done, as part of their job, as professional gatekeepers, because successful subordinates make them look good, to achieve vicariously, to repay past favors or make future favors more likely, to aid women, to develop crucial subordinates, to make friends or to derive satisfaction, or as part of the Generativity Stage as described by Erickson. The kind of aid mentors give includes encouragement, teaching, providing opportunities, counseling, help with career moves, role modeling, providing visibility, friendship, and exposure to power and excitement. Phillips

labels the six stages of the mentoring process as 1) initiation, 2) sparkle, 3) development, 4) disillusionment, 5) parting, and 6) transformation.

Kram (1980) has also developed a theory of mentoring. She conceptualizes the mentoring process along an open systems approach. The relationship is the basic system, the organization is the supra-system in which the relationship exists while the two individuals are considered the interacting subsystems. She classifies the relationship according to functions and phases. There are two categories of functions, career and psychosocial. The five career functions instrumental in advancement include: 1) sponsorship, 2) exposure and visibility, 3) coaching, 4) protection, and 5) challenging work assignments. There are four psychosocial functions involving support and guidance which include: 1) role modeling, 2)acceptance and confirmation, 3) counseling, and 4) friendship. Kram assumes the mentoring process is dynamic in nature, changing over time. She describes four phases including initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. Kram goes on to describe possible motivations for entering a mentor relationship. She suggests the motivations stem from the developmental tasks of the individual's adult career stage. The failure for some individuals to risk a mentor or protege role is explained as unresolved ambivalence about dependence or intimacy.

Alleman (1982) does a good job of integrating previous theories. She examines specific behaviors and psychological characteristics of those involved in a mentor relationship and compares them with those not involved. She also examines interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity as a basis for entering a mentor relationship. Her findings suggest there is no difference in personality characteristics between mentor-protege dyads and nonmentoring pairs. The difference lies in their behaviors. She found that mentors behave differently from nonmentors on 123 specific mentoring behaviors. Furthermore, perceived similarity was not a factor in mentor-protege selection. Mentors and proteges perceived each other more like ideal opposites than like themselves. Alleman concludes that the difference between mentoring and nonmentoring dyads is a difference in behavior not personal attributes and that the perceived similarity or actual similarity is not the basis for attraction in these relationships.

The literature on mentoring assumes that the mentor-protege relationship is beneficial. There have been very few empirical studies which actually document the value of mentoring. Roche (1979) found that subordinates in effective relationships respond more enthusiastically to their superiors and adapt more readily to their superior's assignments than subordinates in ineffective relationships. Thus, mentoring appears to be beneficial on at

least two variables, career advancement and satisfaction.

Collins and Scott (1978) further stress the positive benefits of a mentor relationship. Their article, "Everyone Who Makes it Has a Mentor", is an in depth interview with executives of the Jewel Tea Company. The Jewel Tea Company has had a policy for many years formalizing the mentor relationship for young business managers.

Zaleznik (1977) suggests there is a difference between managers and leaders. It is the development of leadership which needs the benevolence of a mentor. He asserts mentors take risks with people. The risks do not always pay off but the willingness to take them appears to be crucial in the development of leaders.

Given all the theory and assumptions that mentoring is of value, Wilbur (1979) presents a "how to" approach in developing a boss as a mentor. He suggests potential proteges should set the climate, offer feedback, give input, and encourage output, in order to groom upper management for the role of mentor.

Lately there has been an interest in what mentoring means for women (Shapiro, 1978; Halcomb, 1980). These studies emphasize the importance of some kind of mentor relationship for women. Shapiro cautions against viewing mentoring as a panacea. She claims the mentor relationship is but a single element on a continuum of role models and patrons. Halcomb points to the role of luck in finding the right mentor, adding a woman may have many mentors over the course of a career.

Newspapers have run articles urging women and students to go out and get themselves a mentor (De Reimer, 1982; Gantzell, 1980).

Taken as a whole, the literature begins to describe the nature of the mentoring process. Alleman (1982) categorizes the behavior of mentors into three major functions, 1) emotional support and encouragement, 2) teaching and guiding, 3) practical help. See Figure 1 for a summary of these mentor behaviors.

While there is no similar comprehensive list describing the behaviors of proteges, Figure 2 contains a summary of protege behaviors which were gathered from the literature.

To summarize, the literature to date attempts to describe some of the characteristics of mentoring. Most of the research has been done in corporations with managers and supervisors. The present study provides a description of the mentor-protege relationship as it appears in an academic setting. The survey assesses the attitudes of faculty and students toward the mentoring process. Presumably, students and faculty generally agree on a definition of mentoring, think it is a valuable relationship, and display certain personality traits and behaviors if involved in such a relationship.

Figure 1

Mentor Behaviors

EMOTIONAL SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGEMENT

- Has confidence and faith in proteges
- Expresses recognition of potential
- Takes time to listen
- Helps find solutions
- Treats protege as adult
- Demonstrates personal caring
- Supports protege's goals
- Takes personal risks
- Takes pride in protege
- Acknowledges protege success

TEACHING AND GUIDING

- Instructs protege about work
- Instructs protege about politics
- Critiques work
- Encourages protege to take courses
- Teaches career strategies
- Provides role modeling
- Imparts wisdom

PRACTICAL HELP

- Helps with career moves
- Recommends protege for promotion
- Pushes for protege acceptance
- Introduces protege to important people
- Includes protege in meetings
- Gives challenging work assignments
- Allows protege to solve real problems
- Protects protege, serves as buffer
- Shares information

Figure 2

Protege Behaviors

INITIATES	SOCIABILITY
Makes Decisions	Works with people
Motivates others	Works well in a group
Acts as a leader	Gets along with all ages
Initiates relationships	
Makes things happen	
Initiates projects	
COMPLIANCE	AMBITION
Willing to work hard	Prepares for promotion
Willing to take advice	Interested in career advancement
Follows suggestions	Plans career
Listens	Controls own future
Completes assignments	
Conforms	
Accepts authority	
Accepts role as learner	
INDEPENDENCE	PLEASURE
Does things for self	Derives pleasure from work
Takes risks	Sees assignments as relevant
Sometimes disagrees	Sees bosses as interested
Asks great questions	Likes and respects superiors

METHOD

Subjects

The sample consisted of 16 faculty members and 60 doctoral students in the clinical and counseling psychology program at a medium sized southeastern university. Students were asked to complete the questionnaire following a practicum seminar, faculty members were approached individually and asked to return the questionnaire at their leisure. All of the faculty questionnaires handed out were returned and usable for a 100% return rate. Of the sixty-two student surveys distributed, two were not counted because they were incomplete. See Table 1 for a breakdown of faculty and student characteristics by age, sex, number of years in program and rank.

Survey

Two separate questionnaires with similar formats were designed, one for the students and one for the faculty (see appendix A & B). The basic format consisted of an eight page survey with demographic data (age, sex, concentration, etc.), perceived definition of a mentor and protege, self rating on a 5 point scale of personality traits (ambition, maturity, etc.), ranking of 10 possible reasons for becoming a protege, 60 behavioral statements rated on a 5 point scale, i.e. "I enjoy leadership roles", ranking of environmental influences on the mentoring process, and perceived frequency of the occurrence of mentoring within the department.

Table 1

Subject Demographics

Students	%	N	Faculty	%	N
SEX			SEX		
Male	58	35	Male	75	12
Female	42	25	Female	25	4
YEAR IN PROGRAM			RANK		
First	52	31	Professor	13	2
Second	42	25	Associate	25	4
Third	6	4	Assistant	31	5
			Adjunct	31	5
CONCENTRATION			SPECIALTY		
Clinical	77	46	Applied	69	11
Counseling	23	14	Experimental	3	5
ENTERED PROGRAM					
Post-Bachelors	37	22			
Post-Masters	63	38			

Total Student N=60 Age range= 22-44 Mean= 26

Total Faculty N=16 Age range= 28-68 Mean= 39

Analysis of the Data

Following return of the surveys, results were computer coded for analysis. The faculty sample was aggregated by sex, rank, and specialty, while the student sample was analyzed by sex, year in program, concentration, and status upon entering. Chi squares were obtained within subgroups for each of four specific mentoring questions. Subjects were asked to rate themselves on nine personality traits and behaviors using a scale of 1=low to 5=high. Ratings on these nine traits were summed to reflect a total trait score (Minimum score=9, Maximum score=45). Similarly, subjects rated themselves on 60 behavioral questions, 1=completely disagree to 5=completely agree. These scores were summed for each case to determine total behavioral score (Minimum score=60, Maximum score=300). Oneway analysis of variance procedure was used to compare total trait and behavior scores within subgroups.

RESULTS

Students and faculty were asked to respond to four specific mentoring questions (see Table 2). Interestingly, over 94% of both students and faculty desired to become involved in a mentor-protege relationship. While 70% of the students and 100% of the faculty feel they have been involved in a mentor-protege relationship, only 56% of the faculty and 28% of the students feel they are currently involved in such a relationship. Regarding the particular

Table 2

Faculty and Student Responses to Specific Mentoring Questions

	Faculty				Student			
Questions	%Yes	N	%No	N	%Yes	N	%No	N
1) Have you ever been involved in a mentor-protege relationship?	100	16	0	0	70	42	30	18
2) Do you think mentor- is occurring in this program?	62	10	38	6	43	26	57	34
3) Are you currently involved in a mentor-protege relationship?	56	9	44	7	28	17	72	43
4) Would you like to become involved if the opportunity existed?	94	15	6	1	97	58	3	2
	Total N=16				Total N=60			

program, 62% of the faculty feel that mentoring is occurring within the program while only 43% of the students feel that mentoring is taking place.

Respondents were asked to list three adjectives which best describe a mentor and a protege. Table 3 contains those adjectives which appeared on both student and faculty lists.

One section of the survey asked subjects to rank order 10 possible reasons for becoming a mentor and a protege. The following were included as possible reasons for becoming a mentor; 1) To get their own work done, 2) As part of the job, 3) As a professional gatekeeper, 4) Because subordinates make them look good, 5) To achieve vicariously, 6) To repay past favors or make future favors more likely, 7) To aid women, 8) To develop crucial subordinates, 9) To make friends, 10) To derive satisfaction. Students and faculty ranked "To derive satisfaction" as the most important reason for becoming a mentor. Lowest ranked reason for becoming a mentor by the students was "Because subordinates make them look good", while lowest ranked by the faculty was "To aid women."

As for reasons for becoming a protege, subjects were asked to rank the following possibilities; 1) To obtain a sponsor, 2) For exposure and visibility, 3) To obtain coaching, 4) For protection, 5) To be challenged, 6) For role modeling, 7) For acceptance and confirmation, 8) For counseling, 9) For friend-

Table 3

Student and Faculty Description of Mentoring

Mentor Adjectives		Protege Adjectives	
Concerned	Mature	Colleguial	Hard-working
Communicative	Open	Dedicated	Inquiring
Competent	Patient	Dependable	Intelligent
Encourager	Successful	Diligent	Interested
Experienced	Teacher	Eager	Learner
Knowledgable	Tolerant	Enthusiastic	Motivated

ship, 10) To get ahead. Students and faculty were in agreement ranking "For role modeling" as most important. Students viewed "For protection" as the least important reason while faculty ranked "To get ahead" as the least important reason for becoming a protege.

Similarly, subjects were asked to rate certain environmental influences as being more or less influential on a scale of 1 to 5 in forming mentor relationships. These included; 1) Length of residence for students, 2) Faculty/student ratio, 3) Quality of students, 4) Professional rather than research orientation of the program, 5) Age of faculty, 6) Gender of faculty, 7) Goals of students, 8) Faculty/student difference in training background, and 9) Accessibility of faculty. Students and faculty agreed the most influential factor affecting mentoring was the faculty/student ratio. Students felt the least influential factor was the gender of the faculty while faculty members felt the least influential factor was the professional rather than research orientation of the program.

Trait and behavior scores were summed and analyzed by sex, rank, and specialty for faculty respondents and sex, year in program, concentration, and status upon entering for student respondents. (see Tables 4 and 5). The surveys were designed so that high scores would reflect a higher degree of mentoring

Table 4

Mean, Standard Deviation, and F Values of Faculty Trait and Behavior Scores

Category	Trait Score			Behavior Score		
	X	SD	F	X	SD	F
SEX						
Male	35.8	3.8	.98	194.6	18.7	.88
Female	37.8	2.2	NS	204.3	14.5	NS
RANK						
Professor	36.2	.7	.41	197.0	18.4	.34
Associate	37.8	4.7	NS	204.5	17.7	NS
Assistant	36.2	3.6		196.4	25.9	
Adjunct	35.0	3.4		191.6	10.1	
SPECIALTY						
Applied	36.2	3.7	.01	203.6	15.5	6.7
Experimental	36.4	3.4	NS	182.4	14.2	*

* P< .02

Table 5

Mean, Standard Deviation and F Values of Student Trait and Behavior Scores

Category	Trait Score			Behavior Score		
	X	SD	F	X	SD	F
SEX						
Male	36.4	4.0	.17	209.7	14.2	2.0
Female	36.9	4.4	NS	215.6	17.3	NS
YEAR IN PROGRAM						
First	36.4	4.1	1.00	207.5	16.0	3.1
Second	36.4	4.3	NS	216.7	14.4	*
Third	39.5	3.1		220.0	11.8	
CONCENTRATION						
Clinical	36.4	4.2	.82	212.2	16.4	.001
Counseling	37.5	4.2	NS	212.1	13.6	NS
ENTERED PROGRAM						
PostBachelors	35.9	4.2	1.14	210.0	14.1	.65
PostMasters	37.1	4.1	NS	213.4	16.6	NS

* P< .05

qualities for the faculty, and a higher degree of protege qualities for the students (Highest possible trait score=45, highest possible behavior score=300). On the faculty survey, females and faculty members with the rank of professor tied for the highest trait score, although there was no statistical significance. There was a significant difference on behavior scores within the specialty category, ($F= 6.7$, $p < .02$) with applied faculty members scoring higher than experimental faculty, (205.6 versus 182.5).

On the student survey there was a significant difference on behavior scores for the category "year in program" ($F= 3.1$, $p<.05$). Third year students had the highest mean (220.0) with second year students and first year students obtaining 216.7 and 207.5 respectively.

Tables 6 and 7 contain a breakdown of students and faculty in response to the following questions; 1) Have you ever been involved in a mentor-protege relationship in the past?, 2) Do you consider mentoring to be occurring in this program?, 3) Are you currently involved in a mentor-protege relationship?, 4) Would you want to become involved in a mentor-protege relationship if the opportunity existed?

Of the faculty members, 100% reported they had been involved in such a relationship. Significant Chi squares were obtained

Table 6

Percentage and Chi Square Values of Faculty Response to Specific Mentoring Questions

Category	Question 1		Question 2		Question 3		Question 4	
	%	Chi2	%	Chi2	%	Chi2	%	Chi2
SEX								
Male	100		67	.31	58	.07	91	.36
Female	100		50	NS	50	NS	100	NS
RANK								
Professor	100		100	7.4	50	5.8	50	7.4
Associate	100		100	*	100	NS	100	*
Assistant	100		20		20		100	
Adjunct	100		50		60		100	
SPECIALTY								
Applied	100		64	.01	64	.77	100	2.3
Experimental	100		60	NS	40	NS	80	NS

* P< .05

Question 1- Have you ever been involved in a mentor-protege relationship in the past?
Question 2- Do you consider mentoring to be occurring in this program?
Question 3- Are you currently involved in a mentor-protege relationship?
Question 4- Would you want to become involved in a mentor-protege relationship if the opportunity existed?

Table 7

Percentage and Chi Square Values of Student Response to Specific Mentoring Questions

Category	Question 1		Question 2		Question 3		Question 4	
	%	Chi2	%	Chi2	%	Chi2	%	Chi2
SEX								
Male	80	4.0	49	.94	26	.28	94	1.48
Female	56	*	36	NS	32	NS	100	NS
YEAR IN PROGRAM								
First	77	2.1	39	.56	26	1.0	97	.17
Second	60	NS	48	NS	28	NS	96	NS
Third	75		50		50		100	
CONCENTRATION								
Clinical	67	.63	39	1.4	24	1.9	98	.82
Counseling	79	NS	57	NS	43	NS	92	NS
ENTERED THE PROGRAM								
Post Bachelors	55	3.9	36	.68	18	1.8	96	.16
Post Masters	79	*	47	NS	34	NS	97	NS

* P< .04

Question 1- Have you ever been involved in a mentor-protege relationship in the past?
Question 2- Do you consider mentoring to be occurring in this program?
Question 3- Are you currently involved in a mentor-protege relationship?
Question 4- Would you want to become involved in a mentor-protege relationship if the opportunity existed?

within the rank category on two questions, "Do you consider mentoring to be occurring in this program?", (X^2 =7.4, $p < .05$) and "Would you like to become involved in a mentor-protege relationship if the opportunity existed?", (X^2 =7.4, $p < .05$). One hundred percent of faculty members with the rank of Professor and Associate felt mentoring was occurring within the program while only 20% of Assistant and 50% of Adjunct professors felt similarly. Regarding the last question, "Would you like to become involved in a mentor-protege relationship if the opportunity existed?", only 50% of the Professors said yes while 100% of all others responded yes.

On the student survey, significant Chi squares were obtained on the question, "Have you ever been involved in a mentor-protege relationship in the past?" and the category sex (X^2= 3.9, $p < .04$) as well as status upon entering (X^2= 3.9, $p < .04$). Eighty percent of males said they had been involved in a mentoring relationship while only 56% of the females felt they had. Of those who entered the program post-masters, 79% claimed they had been involved in a mentoring relationship while only 55% of those entering post-bachelors felt they had.

DISCUSSION

The study's purpose was to assess the attitudes of professional psychology students and faculty toward the mentoring process. A

basic assumption was that mentoring would be seen as valuable. Indeed, 94% of the faculty and 97% of the students reported they would like to become involved in a mentoring relationship if the opportunity existed. Interestingly, more respondents felt they had been involved in a mentoring relationship in the past, (100% of the faculty, 70% of the students), than were involved in such a relationship at the time of the study. One can only speculate about the cause of such a discrepancy in past and present mentor-protege involvement. It may be the nature of the Psy.D. training model which encourages many different role models in the form of supervisors rather than one major professor as chairman of a dissertation committee. Thus, unlike past experience the student may feel the presence of many role models but not one real mentor. It is notable that many more faculty members felt that mentoring was occurring within the program than students, (62% versus 43%). This finding may be accounted for by the large student/faculty ratio. Very likely, faculty members serve as mentors for some students but many more feel the lack of a mentor relationship. With a large student/faculty ratio, students are the first to feel the effects of a small pool of potential mentors.

Survey responses about the nature of mentoring showed a general agreement between faculty and students on the definition of the mentoring process. Many of the same adjectives were used by both groups to describe a mentor and a protege. Faculty and students

generally agreed the most important reason for becoming a mentor was to derive satisfaction while the most important reason for becoming a protege was for role modeling. Both groups also agreed the most influential factor affecting mentoring was the faculty/ student ratio.

It was predicted students and faculty ranking high on trait and behavior scores would be more likely to be involved in mentor-protege relationships. There is no conclusive evidence for this hypothesis, however, there are notable trends. There was a significant difference in behavior scores among first, second, and third year students as well as between applied and experimental faculty. Third year students obtained higher behavior scores followed by second and first year students respectively. It seems the more senior students exhibit more protege like behaviors. Not surprisingly, applied faculty members scored higher than experimental faculty on mentor behaviors. In a professionally oriented program, applied faculty are closer role models for students than more research oriented experimental faculty.

Chi square analysis of responses to specific mentoring questions revealed significant differences between students for the following question; "Have you ever been involved in a mentor-protege relationship in the past?" Males and students who entered the program post-masters were more likely to have been involved in mentoring relationships in the past. One can easily assume students with

masters degrees have had a longer time in which to establish past relationships but it is less clear why more males than females reported previous mentor-protege relationships. Significant differences on the faculty survey were found within the rank category. One hundred percent of those with the rank of Professor and Associate Professor felt mentoring was occurring in the program. Only half of those with the rank of Professor felt they would want to become involved in a mentor-protege relationship if the opportunity existed.

The study is limited in that it only surveyed students and faculty from a professional program. No attempt was made to obtain data from a scientist-practitioner training program. The survey may have served to heighten the awareness of the mentoring process in the training of professional psychologists. It is but a first step in the description of a complex relationship. Further work needs to be done examining the ingredients of successful mentor-protege pairs in academia. Once specific mentor-protege behaviors have been isolated, workshops aimed at establishing and maintaining such relationships may be developed.

REFERENCES

Alleman, E. (1982) Mentoring relationships in organizations: Behaviors, personality characteristics and interpersonal perceptions. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Akron) Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 75A.

Clawson, J.G. (1979) Superior-subordinate relationships in managerial development. (Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 2158A.

Collins, F. & Scott, P. (1978) Everyone who makes it has a mentor. Harvard Business Review, 56, (4), 89-101.

Davis, R.L. & Garrison, P. (1979) Mentoring: In search of a taxonomy. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

De Riemer, C. (1983) Mentors, what they can and cannot do for you. Today Times, Melbourne, Florida, Feb. 27.

Fleisman, E. (1953) Description of supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 37, 1-6.

Gantzel, L. (1983) Turning professors into mentors. The Hill News, Canton, N.Y., March 24.

Halcomb, R. (1980) Mentors and the successful woman. Across the Board, 17, 13-17.

Harmon-Bowan, M. & Elmore, R.T. (1982) The role of mentoring in the development of professional psychologists. Unpublished manuscript. Presented at the annual meetings of the Southeastern Psychological Association.

Kram, K. (1980) Mentoring processes at work. (Doctoral Dissertation, Yale University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 1960B.

Kanter, R. (1977) Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Levinson, D. (1978) The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Ballentine Books.

Misserian, A. (1980) The process of mentoring in the career development of female managers. (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Massachusetts) Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3654A.

Nedjedlo, R. & Powell, J. (1982) Mentoring and networking annotated bibliography. Association for Counselor Education and Supervision.

Phillips, L. (1977) Mentors and proteges: A study of the career development of women managers and executives in business and industry. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Roche, G. (1979) Much ado about mentors. Harvard Business Review, 57, 14-28.

Shapiro, E., Hazeltine, F. & Rowe, M. (1978) Moving up: Role models, mentors, and the patron system. Sloan Management Review, 19, 51-58.

Wilbur, J. (1979) How to develop your boss: A bottoms up approach to mentoring. Unpublished paper. Service Master Industries, Inc. Downers Grove, Illinois.

Zaleznick, A. (1977) Managers and leaders: Are they different? Harvard Business Review, 55, 67-101.

APPENDIX A

Student Survey

Please fill in the blanks or circle the correct choice.

Age - ___

Sex - Male Female

Year in Program - 1 2 3 4

Concentration - Clinical Counseling

Entered the Program - Post Bachelors

Post Masters

In one or two sentences, what is your definition of a mentor-protege relationship? _____

_____

_____

Select three adjectives that best describe:

A Mentor: _____

_____

_____

A Protege: _____

_____

_____

A mentor-protege relationship has been described in the literature as:

> A relationship in which a person with greater rank or experience takes a personal interest in the education or career development of a person with less rank or experience and arranges for that person beneficial experiences. These experiences and the relationship with the senior member of the pair have a very positive impact on the career progress of the recipient.

Please keep this definition in mind as you fill out the rest of the survey, but do not go back to change previous answers.

Rate the following adjectives by placing an X on the blank corresponding to the number that most closely reflects your assessment of yourself.

	1 Low	2	3	4	5 High
1) Independence	___	___	___	___	___
2) Hard Working	___	___	___	___	___
3) Initiative	___	___	___	___	___
4) Ambition	___	___	___	___	___
5) Maturity	___	___	___	___	___
6) Knowledge	___	___	___	___	___
7) Innovative	___	___	___	___	___
8) Eagerness	___	___	___	___	___
9) Competence	___	___	___	___	___

The following are possible reasons for becoming a mentor. Rank them from 1 to 10 with 1 being the most important reason and 10 being the least.

____ To get their own work done

____ As part of the job

____ As a professional gatekeeper (limiting who enters the profession)

____ Because subordinates make them look good

____ To achieve vicariously

____ To repay past favors or make future favors more likely

____ To aid women

____ To develop crucial subordinates

____ To make friends

____ To derive satisfaction

The following are possible reasons for becoming a protege. Rank them from 1 to 10 with 1 being the most important reason and 10 being the least.

____ To obtain a sponsor

____ For exposure and visibility

____ To obtain coaching

____ For protection

____ To be challenged

____ For role modeling

____ For acceptance and confirmation

____ For counseling

____ For friendship

____ To get ahead

Rate the following statements by placing an X on the blank corresponding to the number that most closely reflects your opinion of yourself.

	1 Completely Disagree	2	3	4	5 Completely Agree
1) I have no hesitation in expressing a dissenting opinion.					
2) I enjoy leadership roles.					
3) I am a good listener					
4) Sometimes I feel my future is out of my control.					
5) I control my destiny.					
6) At times I cannot seem to make up my mind.					
7) I tend to seek out others.					
8) I do not enjoy taking chances.					
9) I like to be taken care of by others.					
10) I would rather be a participant than a leader.					
11) It is wrong to do what it takes to get ahead.					
12) My courses seem like a lot of busy work.					
13) I have been known as a hard worker.					
14) Other people must motivate me.					
15) I am always open to suggestions.					

	1 Completely Disagree	2	3	4	5 Completely Agree
16) There are not enough nonconformists in this world.	1	2	3	4	5
17) Supervisors do not seem to really care about individual students.	1	2	3	4	5
18) People need not follow the suggestions of others.	1	2	3	4	5
19) The courses I am taking now will greatly help me in the field.	1	2	3	4	5
20) I enjoy working with people.	1	2	3	4	5
21) I try to let nature take its course.	1	2	3	4	5
22) Unfinished work bothers me.	1	2	3	4	5
23) People often annoy me.	1	2	3	4	5
24) I enjoy the role of a student.	1	2	3	4	5
25) A career does not take too much planning.	1	2	3	4	5
26) Others have said I am career oriented.	1	2	3	4	5
27) I have a difficult time with people of a certain age.	1	2	3	4	5
28) My professors take an interest in me.	1	2	3	4	5
29) People should not try to be too different.	1	2	3	4	5
30) Family takes precedence over career.	1	2	3	4	5
31) I wait for the other person to initiate a relationship.	1	2	3	4	5

	1 Completely Disagree	2	3	4	5 Completely Agree
32) Others have called me a risk taker.					
33) When things are slow I make my own excitement.					
34) I do not like to take advice from others.					
35) I accept authority.					
36) Work groups have been satisfying.					
37) I take active steps in planning my career.					
38) I would prefer a job working independently rather than with others.					
39) I am a good "cheerleader" when it comes to encouraging others.					
40) I would not call myself an initiator.					
41) I enjoy doing things for myself.					
42) I find it easy to make decisions.					
43) I doubt whether my job will be very much fun.					
44) I follow through on the advice of others.					
45) I tend to be more of a talker than a listener.					
46) I enjoy people of all ages.					
47) I am not very accepting of authority.					

	1	2	3	4	5
	Completely Disagree				Completely Agree
48) I would rather do an independent project than work in a group.					
49) I like and respect most of my professors.					
50) The leaders of this field are not very worthy of respect.					
51) It is difficult for me to accept my role as a learner.					
52) I like to initiate projects.					
53) In class I am the first to raise a question.					
54) Sometimes I do not complete projects.					
55) I try not to ask too many questions.					
56) It is best to keep disagreements to oneself.					
57) I make sure I take the right steps to insure promotion someday.					
58) I enjoy my work.					

To what degree do the following environmental influences effect the possibility of mentor-protege relationships occurring here at FIT?

	1	2	3	4	5
	No Influence				Strong Influence
1) Length of residence for students.					

	1	2	3	4	5
	No Influence				Strong Influence
2) Faculty/student ratio.	1	2	3	4	5
3) Age of faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
4) Quality of students.	1	2	3	4	5
5) Professional rather than research orientation of the program	1	2	3	4	5
6) Gender of faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
7) Goals of students.	1	2	3	4	5
8) Faculty/student difference in training backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5
9) Accessability of faculty.	1	2	3	4	5

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate response.

Have you ever been involved in a mentor-protege relationship in the past?	YES	NO
Do you consider mentoring to be occurring in this program?	YES	NO
Are you currently involved in a mentor-protege relationship?	YES	NO
Would you want to be come involved in a mentor-protege relationship if the opportunity existed?	YES	NO

APPENDIX B

Faculty Survey

Please fill in the blanks or circle the correct choice:

Age- _____

Sex- Male Female

Rank- Professor Associate Assistant Adjunct

Number of years at FIT- _____

Specialty- Clinical Experimental

In one or two sentences, what is your definition of a mentor-protege relationship? _____

_____

_____

Select three adjectives that best describe:

A Mentor: _____

_____

_____

A Protege: _____

_____

_____

A mentor-protege relationship has been described in the literature as:

> A relationship in which a person with greater rank or experience takes a personal interest in the education or career development of a person with less rank or experience and arranges for that person beneficial experiences. These experiences and the relationship with the senior member of the pair have a very positive impact on the career progress of the recipient.

Please keep this definition in mind as you fill out the rest of the survey, but do not go back to change previous answers.

Rate the following adjectives by placing an X on the blank corresponding to the number that most closely reflects your assessment of yourself.

1) Confidence

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

2) Security

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

3) Risk Taking

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

4) Altruism

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

5) Flexibility

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

6) Warmth

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

7) Caring

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

8) Unselfishness

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

9) Information Sharing

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

The following are possible reasons for becoming a mentor. Rank them from 1 to 10 with 1 being the most important reason and 10 being the least.

_____ To get their own work done

_____ As part of the job

_____ As a professional gatekeeper (limiting who enters the profession)

_____ Because subordinates make them look good

_____ To achieve vicariously

_____ To repay past favors or make future favors more likely

_____ To aid women

_____ To develop crucial subordinates

_____ To make friends

_____ To derive satisfaction

The following are possible reasons for becoming a protege. Rank them from 1 to 10 with 1 being the most important reason and 10 being the least.

_____ To obtain a sponsor

_____ For exposure and visibility

_____ To obtain coaching

_____ For protection

_____ To be challenged

_____ For role modeling

_____ For acceptance and confirmation

_____ For counseling

_____ For friendship

_____ To get ahead

Rate the following statements by placing an X on the blank corresponding to the number that most closely reflects your opinion.

	1	2	3	4	5
	Completely Disagree				Completely Agree
1) I do not hesitate to give positive feedback to students.					
2) I try to make students aware of the role and work of a psychologist.					
3) I would like the role of a guru, imparting sage wisdom.					
4) It is important for students to begin to assume some authority.					
5) I seldom get a chance to introduce students to the connections I know.					
6) I have backed certain students and pushed for their acceptance.					
7) I often write letters of recommendation for students.					
8) Students best learn about their professional role through practicum.					
9) I try to help students to find solutions to their problems.					
10) I try not to socialize with students.					
11) I have every confidence in my students' abilities.					
12) Students should be encouraged to take more workshops.					
13) I find myself giving a lot of encouragement to students.					
14) I have helped with the career moves of students.					
15) I feel uncomfortable with self-revealing.					
16) A student should be encouraged to find their own solutions.					
17) I prefer to treat students like adults.					

	1 Completely Disagree	2	3	4	5 Completely Agree
18) Others acknowledge the personal risks I take.	1	2	3	4	5
19) I have trouble allowing others too much independence.	1	2	3	4	5
20) Students do not need my backing.	1	2	3	4	5
21) Students seldom see the real me.	1	2	3	4	5
22) If a student does well I make sure they know it.	1	2	3	4	5
23) I encourage students to become independent and autonomous.	1	2	3	4	5
24) It is not my role to advise students on career moves.	1	2	3	4	5
25) Certain students make me proud.	1	2	3	4	5
26) Many students are not very mature.	1	2	3	4	5
27) It helps people to be aware of who they should and should not get close to.	1	2	3	4	5
28) My courses are challenging.	1	2	3	4	5
29) It is dangerous to remind people too often of their successes.	1	2	3	4	5
30) A faculty member should be equitable and try not to have too many personal favorites.	1	2	3	4	5
31) Not many people can make me feel proud.	1	2	3	4	5
32) I try to steer clear of the recommendation process.	1	2	3	4	5
33) I find myself doubting students' abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
34) I am too young to be considered wise.	1	2	3	4	5
35) There comes a point wher further coursework is not useful.	1	2	3	4	5
36) It is not important for students to know what goes on in faculty meetings.	1	2	3	4	5

	1 Completely Disagree	2	3	4	5 Completely Agree
37) I enjoy being a role model for students.					
38) I have students whom I consider friends.					
39) I take a personal interest in some of my students.					
40) Students learn career strategies when they are out on their own.					
41) I try not to encourage students too much.					
42) It is helpful for students to meet important people in the profession.					
43) Many students are not very mature.					
44) It is important that students be exposed to real problems.					
45) It is helpful for students to be included in meetings.					
46) Students often have unrealistic goals.					
47) Students know best what their goals should be.					
48) Faculty should retain the authority, not the students.					
49) It is difficult for me to tell a student that I think they have potential.					
50) I am accessible to students who need a listening ear.					
51) I hesitate to be too critical of a student's work.					
52) There is no place for politics in academia.					
53) I find myself advising students on career moves.					
54) I enjoy giving constructive criticism to students on aspects of their work.					

55) I have little time to listen to students' concerns. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___
Completely Disagree — Completely Agree

56) Students need not be challenged in order to learn. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

57) I am fairly active in disseminating information. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

58) I serve as a buffer for certain students. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

59) Sometimes I forget to share information with students. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

60) Students need to stand on their own without my protection. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

To what degree do the following environmental influences effect the possibility of mentor-protege relationships occurring here at FIT?

___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___
No Influence — Strong Influence

1) Length of residence for students. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

2) Faculty/student ratio. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

3) Age of faculty. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

4) Quality of students. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

5) Professional rather than research orientation of the program. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

6) Gender of faculty. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

7) Goals of students. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

8) Faculty/student difference in training backgrounds. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

9) Accessibility of faculty. ___1___ ___2___ ___3___ ___4___ ___5___

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate response.

Have you ever been involved in a mentor-protege relationship in the past?	YES	NO
Do you consider mentoring to be occurring in this program?	YES	NO
Are you currently involved in a mentor-protege relationship?	YES	NO
Would you want to become involved in a mentor-protege relationship if the opportunity existed?	YES	NO